



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 12

SHELDON R. MEYER, ESQ.
FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
FOURTH FLOOR
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4156

COPY MAILED

APR 30 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Rocky Stewart, Pal Takacs-Nagy, Timo	:	
Metasportti, and Michael Hyndman	:	
Application No. 09/785,687	:	DECISION NOTING JOINDER AND
Filed: February 16, 2001	:	DISMISSING PETITION UNDER
Attorney Docket No. BEAS-01033US	:	37 C.F.R. §1.47(a) AS MOOT
Title: MESSAGE ROUTING SYSTEM FOR	:	
ENTERPRISE WIDE ELECTRONIC	:	
COLLABORATION	:	

This is in response to the renewed petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.47(a)¹, filed January 28, 2002².

The renewed petition is **DISMISSED AS MOOT**.

The above-identified application was filed on February 16, 2001. On March 21, 2001, applicant was mailed a "Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application - Filing Date Granted" (Notice), requiring an executed oath or declaration in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.63 and the surcharge for its late filing. This Notice set a two-month period for reply.

¹A grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a) requires:

- (1) the petition fee of \$130;
- (2) a surcharge of either \$65 or \$130 if the petition is not filed at the time of filing the application;
- (3) a statement of the last known address of the non-signing inventors;
- (4) proof that a copy of the entire application (specification, claims, drawings, and the oath or declaration) was sent or given to the non-signing inventor for review;
- (5) proof that the non-signing inventor refuses to sign the oath or declaration after having been presented with the application papers if the inventor refuses to sign, or proof that diligent efforts have been made to locate the non-signing inventor if he or she cannot be found, and;
- (6) a declaration which complies with 37 CFR §1.63.

² The petition contains a certificate of mailing dated December 28, 2001.

In reply, applicant filed the original petition (and fee) on July 23, 2001. In a decision mailed on November 15, 2001, the original petition was dismissed for failure to submit proof that diligent efforts were made to locate the non-signing inventor.

With the instant petition, a declaration was filed which was executed by the previously non-signing inventor, obviating the need for a petition. As such, this renewed petition is dismissed as moot.

Receipt of the Power of Attorney is acknowledged.

After this decision is mailed, the application will be forwarded to Technology Center 2100 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to Petitions Attorney Paul Shanowski at (703) 305-0011.



Beverly M. Flanagan
Supervisory Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy